DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 668 EC 112 427

AUTHOR Boyce, Douglas A.; Elzey, Freeman F.
TITLE A Study of the Vocational Adequacy of Former Special Education Students Following High School Graduation.
INSTITUTION San Francisco Unified School District, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE 15 Sep 78
NOTE 85p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Employment; Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; *Handicapped Children; *Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; *Senior High Schools; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *California (San Francisco)

ABSTRACT

A study was made of the effectiveness of the San Francisco Unified School District's Special and Vocational Educational Programs in preparing handicapped students for the work world. Ninety-eight high school graduates were divided into two groups--those who had received vocational training (T) and those who hadn't (NT)--and were interviewed along with their parents, employers, and former teachers. Among the findings were that more T then NT graduates had held a job since graduation and that their jobs tended to be of a higher level; that a greater percentage of the NT group were very dissatisfied with their jobs; and that T group workers needed less supervision and on-the-job training than did NT workers. Among the recommendations resulting from the survey were that there be provisions made for earlier detection of handicapping conditions in students at the elementary and junior high levels, and that continual and intensive counseling be provided for handicapped students during high school. (DLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED163668

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A STUDY OF THE VOCATIONAL ADEQUACY OF FORMER SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS FOLLOWING HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Principal Investigator:
Douglas A. Boyce, Ed.D.
Supervisor, Programs for the Mentally Handicapped
San Francisco Unified School District

Freeman F. Elzey, M.S.
Consultant in Research Methods
San Francisco State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Calif. State Dept. of Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Prepared Under Grant No. 77-108-A Between the California State Department of Education and the San Francisco Unified School District.

September 15, 1978

EC 112427

FOREWORD

Statement of Funding:

The study reported here was part of a program of research in Special Education in the San Francisco Unified School District. The study was carried out during the academic year 1977-78 under the auspices of the Special Education Research Program, supported by Grant No. 77-108-A between the State Department of Education and San Francisco School District.

Disclaimer:

The full report is reproduced here in this form for distribution as a technical report under the grant, and in order to make complete findings available for others engaged in this research area. Results of this study are the sole responsibility of the investigators. Official endorsement of the California State Department of Education or San Francisco Unified School District is not implied.

Douglas A. Boyce

Douglas A. Boyce, Ed.D.
Principal Investigator

September 15, 1978

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This survey was possible only with the cooperation of the many graduates, their parents and employers, and personnel of the San Francisco Unified District who gave of their time to participate in the interviews. We extend our thanks to all of them.

Our particular appreciation goes to the six interviewers, Tonia Burroughs, Alan Dreifuss, Eric Mar, Carolyn Person, Mitchell Sternberg, and Judith Vogel. Their diligent efforts in conducting the interviews and preparing the protocols were invaluable to this project.

Special thanks are due to Mrs. Ursula Farrell and Mrs. Joan Whipple who coordinated the location of interviewees, scheduled appointments and provided attentive control to all administrative aspects of this project.

Our gratitude also goes to Mrs. Kathleen Manning and Evelyn A. Floyd who expertly provided secretarial services to the staff.

ABSTRACT

A Study of the Vocational Adequacy of Former Special Education Students Following High School Graduation

Project No. 77-108-A

Principal Investigator
Dr. Douglas A. Boyce
San Francisco Unified School District
625 Holloway Ave., San Francisco, Ca. 94112

This survey of high school graduates of special education programs in the San Francisco Unified School District was concerned with assessing the adequacy of vocational training programs for Educable Mentally Handicapped, Educationally Handicapped, Hearing Handicapped, Visually Handicapped, and Physically Handicapped students. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 98 graduates who graduated from high school between 1972 and 1977, their parents, employers of working graduates, and school personnel who knew these graduates when in high school. For comparative purposes, data were collected on graduates who had high school vocational training (T) and on those who did not receive such training (NT).

The survey focussed on determining the current status of the graduates with regard to employment, how effective the high school training programs were in preparing them for the world of work and suggestions for strengthening the high school programs for future handicapped students.

Findings were generally more positive for graduates in the T group than for those in the NT group. The study revealed a higher percentage of T graduates than NT graduates had held some type of job since graduation and that the jobs of the T graduates tended to be of a higher level, involving more cognitive and social skills as contrasted to the more physical jobs held by the NT group. More of the NT group were very dissatisfied with their jobs than were the T group. Parents of both groups were somewhat less satisfied with the graduates' work positions than were the graduates themselves. Employers of the T group reported that they needed less supervision and on-the-job training than did employers of the NT group.

Approximately half of the parents of both groups viewed the graduates' general high school experiences as effective in preparing them for work. Three-fourths of the parents of the T group viewed the work experience programs of their graduates as helpful.

Both the T group and NT group suggested more technical instruction, counseling, tighter discipline, more individual attention and understanding teachers as ways to improve the program. Parents suggested that there be more and varied vocational and skills classes specifically designed for students with handicaps and more counseling during high school and after graduation for both graduates and parents. They also emphasized the need to attend to the improvement of students' self concepts and feelings of self worth.

Teachers stressed the need for early diagnosis of disabilities and the beginning of instruction in job-related skills earlier than in high school. They pointed to the need for more vocational training and outside work experience opportunities at the high school level, and a follow-up program of students after graduation.

From these results a series of recommendations were made for improving high school vocational training programs for handicapped students and an evaluation of the interview model as a viable data gathering device was made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	Introduction	1
2	Design of the Study	3
3	Data Gathering Process	10
4	Demographic Description of Survey Samples	14
5	Findings: Occupational Status of Graduates	19
6	Findings: Experiences in High School	32
7	Findings: Recommendations for Improving High School Programs	38
8	Summary and Recommendations	44

Appendix

A Initial Letter to Graduates

B Identification Letter for Interviewers

C Permission Form for Graduate's Signature

D Initial Form of Interview Schedules

E Final Form of Interview Schedules

F Computer Card Coding Schedule

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Population and Sample Descriptions by Handicap Group.	14
2	Numbers of Graduates, Parents, Employers and School Personnel Interviews Conducted for each Handicap Group by Training Status.	15
3	Distributions of Vocationally Trained and Non-Vocationally Trained Graduates by Year of Graduation and Sex of Graduate.	17
4	Frequency of Respondents to Questionnaire Items Relating to Occupations held by Graduates with Prior High School Vocational Training (T) and with no Vocational Training (NT) by Handicap Group.	25
5	Frequency of Respondents to Questionnaire Items Relating to High School Experiences of Graduates with Prior High School Vocational Training (T) and with no Vocational Training (NT).	35
6	Frequency of Respondents to Questionnaire Items Relating to the Ways that High School Programs can be Improved for Graduates with Prior High School Vocational Training (T) and with No Vocational Training (NT).	41

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree of effectiveness the San Francisco Unified School District's Special and Vocational Education programs were in preparing handicapped students for the adult work world.

An ever increasing and important aspect of preparing youth to become contributing members of society has involved the development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to become gainful workers. This too has been applicable for the handicapped as evidenced by the California Special Education Master Plan, Public Law 94-142, and Vocational Education Act provisions.

San Francisco has had an array of vocational alternatives available to assist pupils become work ready but only limited information as to their success or failure. It was important to evaluate what had happened to these Special Education graduates following high school to determine this information. The San Francisco Schools have provided vocational preparation which has included industrial arts, vocational classes at the high school level, a vocational high school, Regional Occupational Program, Community Rehabilitation Workshop, on campus work study experiences, and off campus work study experiences. A majority of the vocational placements for these students has been centered in office training, on campus supervised work experience, off campus training with a variety of community based trainers, and various experiences at the Community Rehabilitation Workshop. It should be noted that the Workshop program may be construed as primarily serving trainable youth and adults. This has not been the case as the program

was geared to serve the higher functioning developmentally disabled adults and other clients manifesting mental health deficits. The severely retarded were not served by this agency.

Prevocational guidance by the way of classes, instruction, and individual counseling has been a part of each disability group's curriculum. This preparation has been initiated during the elementary years with a progressive emphasis on the development of desirable work habits and attitudes. The continuing emphasis and acquisition of these needed skills has varied somewhat from one disability group to another during the later years. This difference may be attributed to the individual and programmatic priority objectives.

During the 1977-78 school year the San Francisco Schools provided Special Education programs for the following number of pupils:

Exceptionality	#High School (10-12)	Total Students
Educationally Handicapped	211	1400
Educable Mentally Handicapped	175	410
Physically Handicapped	24	170
Hearing Handicapped	16	105
Visually Handicapped	12	85

The recent addition of a Vocational Assessment Center, while not having a direct bearing upon this study, has increased the available information on each student regarding vocational opportunities. Special Education work-study teachers, students, and their parents now have more objective data to assist them in the vocational planning and successful placement in preparation for the work world.

CHAPTER 2 DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study focussed upon former students in Special Education programs for the handicapped in the San Francisco Unified School District who graduated from high school between the years 1972 and 1977. The exceptionalities included in this study were students classified as Educable Mentally Handicapped, Educationally Handicapped, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physically Handicapped and Visually Handicapped. The design of this study called for a comparison of graduates within each handicap group who had received vocational training in high school and those who had received no special vocational training.

In order to study the vocational adequacy of the former special education graduates, semi-structured interviews were held with the graduates from such programs, their parents, former high school teachers or counselors, and, where applicable, their current employers. The graduate interviews focussed upon the graduates' history since graduation current work status, satisfaction with the job, effectiveness of the high school preparation for work, and how the high school program could have been improved. The parent interviews involved the parent's perceptions of the graduates readiness for employment, successes and failures in work related tasks, the effectiveness of improvement of the high school training programs. The employer interviews provided information on the type of job held by the graduates, how well prepared the graduate was for performing the required tasks, amount of training needed, how well the high school had prepared the employee for work and suggestions for improvements of the high school program.

School personnel interviews solicited information regarding the former student's adjustment and performance in school as well as vocational skills taught, quality of work experience, and contact with the students since graduation.

IDENTIFICATION OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

The first task of this project was to compile a list of former students who graduated within the five year period and to ascertain the type of special vocational training they had in high school. To accomplish this, program managers of special education programs were asked to supply names of graduates. In addition special education attendance registers for the five year period were examined.

POPULATION SPECIFICATION AND SAMPLE SELECTION

The exhaustive search for names of graduates yielded the following numbers of students which comprise the populations for this study:

Educable Mentally Handicapped	Not Determined
Educationally Handicapped	N= 63
Hard of Hearing and Deaf	N= 22
Visually Handicapped	N= 22
Physically Handicapped	N= 18

The original projection for sample sizes in this study called for twenty graduates with high school vocational training and twenty graduates with no such vocational training within each handicap group. However, the search did not uncover enough graduates to meet this requirement for any group except the Educable Mentally Handicapped. Accordingly, it was decided to attempt interviews with the total populations of the Educationally Handicapped, Hard of Hearing and Deaf, Visually Handicapped and Physically Handicapped groups, and to select random samples of twenty with training and

twenty with no training from among the Educable Mentally Handicapped population.

Because of the size of the Educable Mentally Handicapped population, random replacement of selected graduates who could not be located by mail or telephone was made from existing population, attempting to meet the requirement of at least twenty graduates with prior high school vocational training and twenty graduates with no training from this group.

SELECTION OF INTERVIEWERS

The quality of any study that utilizes the interview techniques as its source of data depends primarly upon the ability of the interviewers. In this study it was particularly important that interviewers be selected who could quickly establish rapport and conduct valid interviews with people of widely differing backgrounds, including graduates having major mental, sensory and physical disabilities, their parents, employers in a variety of businesses, and teachers and counselors in the public school system.

In the inital phase of this project considerable attention was given to the selection of individuals to fill this critical interviewer role. The district classified personnel office announced the openings for applications for the position of interviewers.

The project received a total of 25 applications for these positions. Each applicant was asked to submit a personal background data sheet and each was interviewed by the project coordinator. Particular attention was given to the experiential background of the applicants, as well as his/her sensitivity to and understanding of the unique problems facing disabled people.

Careful screening of the applicants resulted in the selection of six individuals who possessed the personal characteristics that were felt necessary to successful interviewing. These characteristics included persistence in making contact and setting up appointments, understanding and compassion for the problems facing graduates, an ability to relate verbally with varying types of individuals, an ability to accurately record the pertinent data, and a kind of perpetual optimism to keep going in the face of difficulties.

The six selected applicants consisted of three females and three males, ranging in age from 23 to 31, with the following ethnic backgrounds: two Caucasians, two Blacks, one Chinese, and one Chicano. The interviewers possessed bilingual skills including Spanish and Chinese. Their extensive educational backgrounds included graduation from various institutions such as bay area high schools, city colleges, state colleges and University of California campuses. A few of the interviewers were holders of teaching credentials and showed immense interests in Special Education. With regard to related work experience, they all had worked in either academic, therapeutic or vocational settings. Their former positions included teaching at various levels, assisting handicaps in multifarious ways, tutoring, and counseling. Agencies where the interviewers were formerly employed include San Francisco Unified School District, Mission Recreational Center, Special Olympics, Napa State Hospital, San Francisco Head Start Program, Telegraph Hill Neighborhood Center and day care centers. Most of the interviewers were recommended by their past employers as excellent communicators who were ready and willing to provide services to all.

INTERVIEW PROCESS

The process of notifying graduates in this study, obtaining their cooperation and conducting the interviews included the following steps:

1. All selected graduates were sent a letter describing the project and inviting their participation. This letter informed them that they would receive a $10 stipend for participation and included a form for the graduate to fill out and return. A copy of this letter is included in this report at Appendix A.

2. For graduates returning the forms indicating willingness to participate, an interviewer phoned to arrange for a time and place for the interview. In cases where the forms were not returned by the graduate, a follow-up phone call was made to the graduate and a verbal solicitation for cooperation was made. When the initial letter was returned by the post office as undeliverable, a concerted effort was made to obtain the current address and phone number for the graduate. This process included the use of reverse phone directories, contact with former teachers of the graduates, talking to neighbors, etc.

3. Interviewers were assigned particular graduates based on geographical location for ease of contacting. An interviewer, when assigned a particular graduate, did all four interviews (graduate, parent, employer, teacher) for that graduate. This provided continuity across interviews for a given graduate and gave the interviewer four viewpoints from which to assess the status of the graduate.

An attempt was made to assign graduates from all disability groups to each interviewer, rather than to have interviewers specialize in a particular disability group. This assignment across groups reduced the possiblity of interviewer bias affecting the results of the various groups differentially. Due to individual committments, some interviewers were able to conduct more interviews than others. In the few cases where parents did not speak English, a relative or friend who was bilingual interpreted for the interviewer. For some Hearing Handicapped graduates the use of a sign language interpreter from the "Deaf Self Help Center" was used. In addition, some interviews with Hearing Handicapped graduates were conducted with paper and pencil. The number of graduates interviewed by each interviewer for the five disability groupings is given below:

	Interviewer					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
EMH	6	12	7	5	8	4
EH	7	8	2	0	4	3
HH	2	2	3	0	1	1
VH	4	3	4	1	0	0
PH	1	3	2	3	1	1
Total	20	28	18	9	14	9

4. Each interviewer made appointments with graduates by phone. Interviews were conducted at a location agreed to by graduates and interviewers. The majority of interviews took place in the home of the graduates, although a few were held in the research office or in a location near the graduates' homes. Each interviewer had a letter of introduction to be used for identification if needed. This letter is included as Appendix B. At the conclusion of the graduate interviews, the interviewer asked each graduate to sign a letter granting permission for the interviewers to

speak with the graduate's parent and employer. If this permission was granted, the interviewer proceeded to set up appointments with parents and employer; if denied, the only other source of information regarding the graduate was his/her former high school teacher or counselor.

5. Parent interviews were conducted, for the most part, in the parents' homes, although provision was made to conduct these interviews by telephone if necessary.

6. Employer interviews were scheduled by the graduate's current employer at a time and place convenient to the employer. These usually took place during working hours at the employer's place of business.

7. School personnel interviews were scheduled with vocational teachers, work-experience coordinators and/or guidance counselors who had contact with the graduate during his/her high school enrollment. Interviews were conducted at the school, at the homes of the teachers, or by phone when it was impossible to set up a meeting.

USE AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS

Particular attention was given to protecting the rights of the graduates. Interviewers explained the purpose of the interview to the graduate prior to conducting the interview. The permission of the graduate for interview with parents and employers was obtained prior to conducting such interviews. The form used for this permission is presented in Appendix C.

During the interviews, graduates were not referred to as having been in special education programs for the handicapped while in high school. They were merely referred as high school graduates. This precaution was particularly important in interviewing employers when such relevations might prejudice the opinion of the employer toward the graduate.

CHAPTER 3 DATA GATHERING PROCESS

Data were obtained through the use of semi-structured interviews using open-ended questions as well as some Likert-type scale items.

Four interview schedules were developed for use by interviewers with graduates, parents, employers and school personnel. These schedules were identical for all disability groups, thus permitting across group comparisons.

The initial forms of the four interview schedules are presented in Appendix D. These schedules were in the form of questions designed to elicit responses regarding the graduates history since graduation, work experience and performance, job satisfaction, quality of high school preparation, and suggestions for improving the high school vocational education program. The questions in each of these instruments were developed to obtain pertinent information relevant to that particular source and thus provide four points of perspective. Content validity of the instruments was established by comparing the interview questions with the objectives of the survey, insuring that all necessary information would be solicited. The initial form of the instruments was reviewed by program specialists in the district and vocational teachers to assure their content validity and applicability.

PILOT TESTING

Each interview schedule was pilot tested on three selected graduates who had vocational training in high school, their parents/guardians, employers and teachers/counselors to determine the appropriateness, usefulness, and clarity of the questions as well as their sequencing and ease of presentation.

As a check on the reliability of the information gathered by this process, two interviewers were present at each pilot test interview. They independently transcribed the responses of the interviews and rated responses where called for. This process a) aided in the training of interviewers by giving them field experience in pairs prior to the actual survey, and b) provided reliability data on the consistency of their recorded information and rating.

TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS

After development of the initial interview schedules a training session was held with the interviewers in which they reviewed the interview procedure in detail including practicing introducing the interview, asking the interview questions, probing where necessary, and recording their interviewee's responses on the interview form. Interviewers were then paired and assigned graduates for their initial interviews. After these interviews, a de-briefing session was held in which experiences of the interviewers were shared and suggestions were made regarding revision of the schedules. One outcome of this meeting was the suggestion that interviewers be permitted to vary the manner in which questions are asked. This flexibility was needed to accomodate to particular interviewer "styles" as well as to adapt to the range of disabilities encountered in the study. The outcome of this meeting was a decision to revise the interview schedules by eliminating the specific wording of questions and substituting in their place topic headings around which the interviewers could fashion questions to fit a particular interviewee. As a consequence, the final forms of the interview schedules contain only topic headings. These final forms of the schedules upon which the findings of this study are based are presented in Appendix E.

In addition to the initial interview training meeting a series of weekly meetings among interviewers was held in which each interviewer recounted his/her experiences during the week. Interviewing procedures were sharpened and additional guidelines developed as warranted. These sessions served to further standardize the interviewing process among the six interviewers.

DATA PROCESSING PROCEDURES

During and immediately after each interview the interviewer prepared a report form, providing all pertinent information asked by the topic heading in the interview schedule. In addition to the objective data recorded by the interviewer, he/she also prepared a written statement of subjective impressions of the session. These included feelings regarding the status of the graduate, projections for the graduate's future, unique problems encountered in the interview situation, etc.

These report forms were then typed and filed in individual case study folders. The information contained in these interview protocols form the basis of the data reported herein.

Data analysis took two forms. The responses to fifty interview items across the four interviews were reduced to a categorical rating system and each interview was judged by this system. These ratings were then placed on IBM mark-sense cards for computer analysis. The categorical system used for these ratings was developed from a content analysis of the responses themselves and is presented in Appendix F.

Computer analysis of the ratings yielded frequency and percentage data for each of the fif ty variables for the various groups and consitute much of the tabular presentations in the next chapters.

In addition, much non-quantifiable information was contained in the interview protocols. These responses were summarized by hand and are presented in descriptive form.

The six interviewers who conducted the 321 interviews during the project period acquired considerable experience in the interview process and developed a great deal of insight into the problems facing these graduates as they move into adulthood, parents' feelings regarding their children, employers' attitudes toward the graduates as workers, and teachers' evaluations of them as students. Thus, the interviewers themselves became an additional source of information for this project.

At the conclusion of the interviewing process, debriefing sessions were held with the interviewers to obtain their impressions, feelings, comments, and suggestions regarding the entire project. Their comments were tape recorded and are incorporated as part of this report.

As stated in the preceding chapter, reliability of the data gathered by the interviewers was ascertained by having two interviewers present during the initial interviews. One interviewer conducted the session by asking the questions called for in the interview schedule; both interviewers independently recorded the responses on the record sheets. Comparison of the recorded responses of the pairs of interviewers revealed virtually identical entries. This high degree of reliability is not surprising in view of the objective nature of the information being sought and the instructions to the interviewers to record ver batim responses where possible.

CHAPTER 4 DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY SAMPLES

The major focus of this study was on the comparison of graduates from high school special education programs who had received a programmatic vocational training program, herein called the "trained" group, with those who did not received such vocational training, called the "non-trained" group. The effective samples upon which the findings in this report are based are those graduates, parents, employers, and school personnel whom names, addresses and phone numbers of graduates was discussed in Chapter 3. As with any study involved in contacting individuals from records that are from one to five years old, there were many graduates on the original lists that were unable to be interviewed. Table 1 presents the potential samples in the five handicapped groups, the number actually interviewed and the various reasons for the inability to contact others.

Table 1

Population and Sample Descriptions by Handicap Group

	EMH	EH	HH	VH	PH	TOTAL
Potential Sample	96*	63	22	22	18	221
Sample Surveyed	42	24	9	12	11	98
Not surveyed because:						
Unable to locate	38	29	8	8	6	89
Moved from area	9	7	3	1	1	21
Refused	7	3	2	1	0	13
Percentage of Potential Sample Interviewed	44%	38%	41%	55%	61%	44%

* This does not represent the total number of EMH students, only those actually pursued during this project.

Because of the small population of graduates in the EH, HH, VH. and PH groups, attempts were made to locate every known graduate in these groups. For the EMH graduates, where there was a very large number graduating during the five year period, graduates were randomly selected until the number interviewed totaled 25 with vocational training and 17 with no training. In order to secure this sample, 221 graduates were pursued before the 42 interviews were accomplished. Table 1 indicates the percentages of pursued graduates within each handicap group that were actually interviewed.

The numbers of the various types of interviews conducted during this study for the four handicap groups are presented in Table 2. This table presents the division of the graduates into "trained" (T), and "not trained" (NT) categories.

Table 2

Numbers of graduates, parents, employers and school personnel interviews conducted for each handicap group by training status

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
Graduates Interviews	25	17	10	14	5	4	4	8	9	2	53	45
Parent Interviews	22	16	10	12	4	3	3	6	5	1	44	38
Employer Interviews	12	10	4	9	4	3	1	4	4	0	25	26
School Personnel Interviews	25	14	9	8	5	3	2	8	8	2	49	35

As shown in Table 2 a total of 315 interviews were conducted during this study. The sample consisted of 98 high school graduates who were enrolled in special programs for the handicapped. Fifty-three of these graduates were classified as having vocational training and 45 were not so classified. The critera used for determining the classification of graduates are as follows:

Vocational Training:

EMH & EH	Outside Work Experience, which consists of off-campus job placement for two hours/day during school hours; supervised by a special education teacher.
HH, VH & PH	Outside Work Experience and/or four or more semesters of clerical or shop classes including concentration in Home Economics, Wood or Metal Shop or Typing with a "B" average.

Non-Vocational Training:

EMH & EH	No Outside Work Experience supervised by special education teacher. May have had jobs <u>on own</u> after school or during summer. May have had Inside Work Experience, (jobs on campus), or office training or vocational guidance classes.
HH, VH & PH	No Outside Work Experience supervised by special education teacher. Fewer than four semesters of shop or clerical classes with "B" average. May have had jobs <u>on own</u> either after school or during the summer.

Table 3 presents the distribution of graduates by year of graduation and by sex of graduates for each of the handicap groups.

Table 3

Distributions of Vocationally Trained and Non-Vocationally Trained graduates by Year of Graduation and Sex of Graduate

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
Graduated 1972	2	4						2			2	6
1973	2	4	1	1		1		1			3	7
1974	3	1		2	1		1	2			5	5
1975	9	4	2	4	1	2		2	1		13	12
1976	8	3	4	2	2		2	1	5	2	21	8
1977	1	1	3	5	1	1	1		3		9	7

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
Males	13	14	9	11	3	3	1	5	7	1	33	34
Females	12	3	1	3	2	1	3	3	2	1	20	11

As shown here, the majority of the graduates surveyed in this study graduated in 1975 and 1976. This table also reveals that, for the EMH group, 49% of the male sample was vocationally trained whereas 65% of the females received vocational training.

Eighty percent of the "vocationally trained" graduates and 87% of the "not vocationally trained" graduates were living at home. Seven graduates were married and living in their own households.

The "trained" and "non-trained" groups did not differ appreciably in the amount of training they received after high school graduation. Of interest is the finding that approximately 28% of the graduates have gone to college and approximately 30% have attended trade school. Twenty three percent of the total sample indicated that they had no further schooling or vocational training after high school.

CHAPTER 5 FINDINGS: OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF GRADUATES

The analyses of the survey results are divided into three major topical headings--those relating to 1) the occupations held by the graduates subsequent to high school graduation, 2) the high school training experiences of the graduates, and 3) suggestions for improving the vocational preparation of handicapped students in high school. The findings regarding occupational status are presented in this chapter; those relating to high school experiences and suggestion for improvement are presented in Chapter six and seven, respectively.

In each of these three chapters on findings, a narrative description of the salient findings is presented, followed by a table presenting the supportive quantatitive data. These tables present the data on the various items as rated according to the Coding Schedule presented in Appendix E. For each item, frequency data are presented for those students classified as having prior high school vocational training (T) and those having no such training (NT) for each handicap group and for the total samples. In addition, percentages of respondents coded at the various levels within each item are presented for the total samples in order to facilitate direct comparison between the "trained" (T) graduates and the "not trained" (NT) graduates. (Data within each of the handicap groups were not converted to percentages due to the small sample of graduates in each group.) For each item, the source of the data (graduate, parent, employer, school personnel) is shown in parentheses following the item title.

In examining the data presented in this report the reader should be aware of four factors which limit the generalizability of the findings:

1) The small sample sizes, especially in the HH, VH and PH groups, does not permit firm generalizations to the populations of graduates with these handicaps.

2) In post hoc studies such as this, where the "training" and no training" groups are compared, there is potential threat to the internal validity of the study due to selection bias inherent in the process of originally determining which students were to be provided with vocational training programs and which were not.

3) The rather rigid criteria used to classify students into the "training and "no training" groups for purpose of data analysis may have resulted in students being classified as "no training" when, in fact, they had many work related experiences, such as after school jobs, some non-vocational classes which did assist in developing vocational skills, non-school-supervised summer work experience, etc. With larger samples it would have been possible to analyze the effects of such varied experiences.

4) As shown in Table 1, within each of the handicap groups there was a large percentage of graduates who were not able to be located and therefore were not interviewed. This raises the possiblity of selection bias, in that the study samples may not be representative of the total population of graduates since there was no way to determine whether the graduates that were located and interviewed differed materially on the variables under study from those that were unable to be located.

Table 5 presents the findings relating to the occupations held by the graduates since graduation. Salient findings from this table are summarized below. These comments are primarily extracted from the total group findings; the reader is encouraged to inspect the table for the findings relative to particular handicap groups.

In Table 5 it can be seen that 91% of the "trained" group (T) has held some type of job since graduation as compared to 76% of the "not trained" group (NT) (Item 4.1). Of those employed, 50% of the NT group were engaged in jobs requiring primarily physical skills whereas only 40% of the T group held these jobs. (Item 4.2). This is also evident in item 4.4 where 48% of the NT group were rated as primarily using large or small muscle skills in their jobs as compared with 32% of the T group. Jobs involving clerical skills were held by 23% of the T group but only by 7% of the NT group. Jobs requiring common sense and responsibility were held by 19% of the T group in contrast to only 10% of the NT group.

Employers reported that 38% of the NT group worked as laborers in contrast to 14% of the T group, whereas 64% of the T group was involved in office work or jobs requiring manual dexterity such as assembly work or packaging as compared to only 16% of the NT group. (Item 4.19). These findings were generally borne out in item 4.11 where the NT group reported that 70% had jobs requiring skills in working with hands or in construction and mechanical jobs, in contrast to 44% for the NT group.

The T and NT groups did not differ appreciably in the amount of on-the-job training needed (Item 4.5) with over 40% of both groups

being rated "little" or "none." With regard to the amount of supervision needed (Item 4.6), 56% of the T group needed "a lot" or "some" as compared to only 23% of the NT group.

For the NT group, 35% of the graduates reported that their jobs required excessive physical effort (Item 4.15) in contrast to 20% of the T group. Also, the NT group had 17% indicating excessive mental/emotional demands of the job (Item 4.16) whereas only 7% of the T group were so rated.

Both the T and NT groups were generally satisfied with their jobs (Item 4.7), with 17% of the NT group being "very dissatisfied" in contrast to only 2% of the T group. However, the interpretation of the responses to this item must be tempered by the fact that 13 of the T group and 8 of the NT group rated on this item were not actively employed at the time of the interview, but had just recently been employed.

Parents were somewhat less satisfied with the graduates' work position (Item 4.17), with 18% of the T and 16% of the NT parents indicating "very dissatisfied." However, the parents did not feel that the graduates themselves were that dissatisfied with their jobs, with only 7% of the T parents and 11% of the NT parents rating their graduates as being "very dissatisfied" (Item 4.18).

In the T group, 70% of the graduates indicated that they were qualified for a better job (Item 4.12) and 78% of the NT group said they were qualified. Slightly more than half of the T and NT groups indicated that their jobs offered opportunity for advancement. (Item 4.13).

Of particular interest is the finding that 64% of the T group and 66% of the NT group desired to change jobs (Item 4.14). The reader is again reminded that 13 of the T graduates and 8 of the NT graduates who were rated on this item were, in fact, not employed at the time of the interview. Thus, these graduates undoubtedly had a desire to obtain job and responded "Yes" on this item.

In finding a job (Item 4.8) 55% of the T group and 85% of the NT group reported "no problems." Thirty-one percent of the T group reported "too little training" as opposed to 12% of the NT group.

Graduates in both the T and NT groups indicated that they got their jobs primarily through agencies, rehabilitation counselors or friends. (Item 4.9). Twenty percent of the T group and 17% of the NT group indicated they got their jobs on their own. Twelve percent of the T group, and none of the NT group received help in getting their jobs from their high school counselors or teachers.

Employers indicated that 44% of the T group was hired through referrals from the Department of Rehabilitation or through their high school counselor/teacher as opposed to only 27% of the NT group having such referrals (Item 4.22) and they indicated that 32% of the T group and only 19% of the NT group were well prepared when hired (Item 4.23). However, when asked about the graduates' ability to perform the job (Item 4.24), the employers rated 75% of the T group and 82% of the NT group as "excellent" or "good." On the other hand, 18% of the NT group and none of the T group was rated "poor" on this item.

Employers reported that 39% of the NT group needed "a lot" or "excessive" supervision (Item 4.20) as contrasted to only 21% of the

T group. There was some difference in the amount of on-the-job training needed, with 35% of the T group and 44% of the NT group rated by employers as needing "a lot" or "excessive." (Item 4.21).

On their ability to relate to co-workers, employers rated 84% of the T group and 62% of the NT group as "excellent."

Employers generally rated the NT graduates as higher in their ability to learn new tasks (Item 4.26), speed and efficiency (Item 4.27), punctuality (Item 4.28) and reliability (4.29).

In general, the findings reported in this chapter indicate that a higher percentage of graduates in the T group had been employed since graduation than in the NT group and suggests that the jobs held by the T group required a broader range of cognitive and social skills than the more physical ones held by the NT group. This difference in the occupational levels of the two groups should be taken into account when interpreting the ratings on other variables. For example, it may well be that the level of the jobs held by the T group necessarily required more training and supervision as well as demanding more attentiveness and responsibility on the part of the graduate. This may also account for the larger proportion of the T group indicating insufficient training in high school for the requirements of their current jobs.

In both the T and NT groups the graduates indicated satisfaction with their jobs. Also, there was a desire to change jobs and a feeling that they were qualified for better jobs. This in part may be a reflection of the fact that 21 of the graduates were not currently employed at the time of the survey but had just recently held jobs.

Table 4

Frequency of Respondents to Questionnaire Items Relating to Occupations held by Graduates with Prior High School Vocational Training (T) and with no Vocational Training (NT) by Handicap Group.

4.1 Working Status of Graduates (Graduate Interview)

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% of TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
Never Worked	1	5	1	1		1	1	2	2	2	5	11	9	24
Full Time-Independent	6	6	4	4	3	1	1	1	3		17	12	32	27
Part Time-Independent	7	3	2	5	1	1	1				11	9	21	20
Full Time-Sheltered	2	2		1		1			1		3	4	6	9
Part Time-Sheltered	6		1	1	1		1	3	3		12	4	23	9
Other	3	1	2	2				2			5	5	9	11
4.2 Type of Job Held (Graduate Interview)														
Physical Skills	14	6	2	8	1	1					17	15	40	50
Social Skills	2		1								3		7	
Mental Skills			1				1	1	1		2	1	5	3
Combinations of Above	6	5	4	3	4	2	2	4	5		21	14	49	47
Not Rated	3	6	3	3		1	1	3	3	2	10	15		
4.3 Type of Transportation to Job (Graduate Interview)														
Walk	1			2		1					1	3	2	10
Bus	16	8	4	3	2	2	2	4	3		27	17	61	59
Car	3	3	3	5	2			1	4		12	9	27	31
Other	1		1		1		1				4		9	
Not Rated	4	6	2	4		1	1	3	2	2	9	16		
4.4 Primary Job Skills Needed (Graduate Interview)														
Large Muscle	8	3	2	4							10	7	23	24
Clerical	1	1	1		3	1	1		4		10	2	23	7
Small Muscle	4	3		3		1					4	7	9	24
Common Sense & Responsibility	5	1	2	2	1						8	3	19	10
Relating to People	1	1				1		4	1		2	6	5	21
Other or None	3	2	2	2	1		1		2		9	4	21	14
Not Rated	3	6	3	3		1	2	4	2	2	10	16		

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% of TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
4.5 Amount of On-The Training Needed (Graduate Interview)														
A Lot	4	2	1	2		1	1				6	5	14	18
Some	9	3	2	3	2	1		3	5		18	10	43	36
Little	6	5	2	3	1	1	1	1	2		12	10	29	36
None	2	1	2	2	2						6	3	14	11
Not Rated	4	6	3	4		1	2	4	2	2	11	17		
4.6 Amount of Supervision Needed (Graduate Interview)														
A Lot	3			1							3	1	7	4
Some	11	2	3	4	2	1		1	4		20	8	49	29
Little	3	5	2		2	1		2	2		9	8	22	29
None	4	4	2	5	1	1	1	1	1		9	11	22	39
Not Rated	4	6	3	4		1	3	4	2	2	12	17		
4.7 Job Satisfaction (Graduate Interview)														
Very Satisfied	10	5	1	3	2	1		2	6		19	11	44	37
Somewhat Satisfied	9	3	5	6	2	2	2	2	1		19	13	44	43
Somewhat Dissatisfied	2		1	1	1						4	1	9	3
Very Dissatisfied	1	3		1				1			1	5	2	17
Not Rated	3	6	3	3		1	2	3	2	2	10	15		
4.8 Problems in Finding Job (Graduate Interview)														
No Problems	9	9	3	7	5	2	2	4	4		23	22	55	85
Too Little Training	7	1	3	1		1			3		13	3	31	12
Filing Out Application	4		1	1							5	1	12	4
Interviews/tests	1										1		2	
Not Rated	4	7	3	5		1	2	4	2	2	11	19		
4.9 Method of Getting Job (Graduate Interview)														
Agency	4	3	3	3	2	1	1	3	3		13	10	32	34
Self	5	2	1	2	1			1	1		8	5	20	17
Rehab. Counselor	5	2		2	1	1			1		7	5	17	17
Friend	3	4	1	1	1		1				6	5	15	17
Parent	1		1	4							2	4	5	14
H.S. Counselor/tch.	3		1						1		5		12	
Not Rated	4	6	3	2		2	2	4	3	2	12	16		

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% of TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
4.10 Skills Learned in H.S. (Graduate Interview)														
None or Few	6	7	1	8	1	1	1		2		11	16	23	57
Office Training	4	3	2		2	1	1	1	3		12	5	30	18
Mechanical/Elec.	4	1	2	1	1						7	2	18	7
Academics	1		1		1			3	2		5	3	12	11
Other	4	1	1	1							5	2	12	7
Not Rated	6	6	3	4		1	2	4	2	2	13	17		
4.11 Job Skills (Graduate Interview)														
Working with hands	8	2	2	4		1					10	7	23	58
Serving People	2	3		1		1		4	3		5	9	12	21
Office Machines	1	1	1	1		1					2	3	5	7
Construction & Mechanical	5	3	3	2	1						9	5	21	12
None		1			1						1	1	2	2
Clerical Skills	2		1		3		2		4		12		28	
Other	4										4		9	
No Rating	3	7	3	6		1	2	4	2	2	10	20		
4.12 Qualified for better job? (Graduate Interview)														
Yes	10	8	6	6	5	3	1	4	6		28	21	70	78
No	8	2	1	4			1		1		11	6	28	22
Don't know	1										1		2	
Not Rated	6	7	3	4		1	2	4	2	2	13	18		
4.13 Opportunity for Advancement (Graduate Interview														
Yes	8	6	5	7	3		1	2	4		21	15	57	56
No	9	3	2	3	1	3	1	1	3		16	10	43	37
Don't know		1		1								2		7
Not Rated	8	7	3	3	1	1	2	5	2	2	16	18		
4.14 Desire to change jobs? (Graduate Interview)														
Yes	11	7	5	6	4	2	2	4	3		25	19	64	66
No	5	4	2	3	1				4		12	7	31	24
Don't know	2			2		1					2	3	5	10
Not Rated	7	6	3	3		1	2	4	2	2	14	16		

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% of TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
4.15 Physical effort needed on the job (Graduate Interview)														
Excessive	4	5	2	2		1	1	2	1		8	10	20	35
Average	9	3	4	7	2	1	1	2	3		19	13	46	45
Little	8	3	1	2	2	1			3		14	6	34	21
Not Rated	4	6	3	3	1	1	2	4	2	2	12	16		
4.16 Mental/emotional demands of the job (Graduate Interview)														
Excessive	3	2		1		1		1			3	5	7	17
Average	11	3	4	4	1	1	2	2	6		24	10	59	34
Little	7	6	3	6	3	1		1	1		14	14	34	48
Not Rated	4	6	3	3	1	1	2	4	2	2	12	16		
4.17 Parent's Satisfaction with graduates work position (Parent Interview)														
Very Satisfied	5	2	2	2	1		1	2	4		13	6	30	16
Somewhat Satisfied	6	8	3	8	2	3	1	1	1	1	13	21	30	57
Somewhat Dissatisfied	6	3	3		1			1			10	4	23	11
Very Dissatisfied	5	3	2	2			1	1			8	6	18	16
Not Rated	3	1		2	1	1	1	3	4	1	9	8		
4.18 Parent's perception of graduate's satisfaction (Parent Interview)														
Very Satisfied	6	3		3	1		1	2	2		10	8	22	22
Somewhat Satisfied	7	7	5	4	2	3	1	2	3	1	18	17	40	46
Somewhat Dissatisfied	7	5	5	2	1		1	1			14	8	31	22
Very Dissatisfied	3	1		3							3	4	7	11
Not Rated	2	1		2	1	1	1	3	4	1	8	8		
4.19 Specific tasks or functions of graduate (Employer Interview)														
Laborer	2	4	2	6							4	10	14	38
Office Work			1	2	3	1	1		4		9	3	32	12
Manual Dexterity	6				1	1	1		1		9	1	32	4
Public Service	3	1		1		1	1	3			4	6	14	23
Delivery	1	3	1	1							2	4	7	15
Other		2										2		8
Not Rated	13	7	6	4	1	1	1	5	4	2	25	19		

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% OF TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
4.20 Amount of Supervision Needed Employer Interview														
None or Little	1	2	1	2	1	3	1		4		8	7	29	27
Some	7	3	2	6	2		2		1		14	9	50	35
A Lot	3	3	1	1				3			4	7	14	27
Excessive	1	2			1			1			2	3	7	12
Not Rated	13	7	6	5	1	1	1	4	4	2	25	19		
4.21 Amount of on-the-job Training Needed (Employer Interview)														
None or Little	3	1	2	3	1						6	4	21	16
Some	5	5	2	4	1		1	1	3		12	10	43	40
A Lot	1	2		2	1	2	1		1		4	6	14	24
Received Training Previous to Hiring	3	1			1	1	1	3	1		6	5	21	20
Not Rated	13	8	6	5	1	1	1	4	4	2	25	20		
4.22 Method of Hiring (Employer Interview)														
Dept. of Rehab.	4	2		1	1	2			1		6	5	22	19
Friend	1	5	2	1	1	1					4	7	15	27
Self	2	2		2	1		1				4	4	15	15
Teacher/Counselor	2			1			1	1	3		6	2	22	8
Family	1		1	3							2	3	7	12
Misc. Agency	2	1	1	1	1			3	1		5	5	19	19
Not Rated	13	7	6	5	1	1	2	4	4	2	26	19		
4.23 Preparation of Graduate When Hired (Employer Interview)														
Well Prepared	3		1		2	2	2	3	1		9	5	32	19
Prepared	1	4	2	1					1		4	5	14	19
Somewhat Prepared	7	4	1	5	1		1	1	1		11	10	39	38
Not at All Prepared	1	2		3	1	1			2		4	6	14	23
Not Rated	13	7	6	5	1	1	1	4	4	2	25	19		

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% OF TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
4.24 Ability to to Perform Job (Employer Interview)														
Excellent	2	2	3	2	2	1	1	2	2		10	7	34	32
Good	6	5	2	4	2	2	1	2	1		12	11	41	50
Satisfactory	4								1	1	5	1	17	5
Fair	1								1		2		7	
Poor		1		2				1				4		18
Not Rated	12	9	5	6	1	1	2	4	4	2	24	22		
4.25 Relating to Co-workers (Employer Interview)														
Excellent	4	4	2	3	3	1	1	1	2		12	9	46	35
Good	7	2	1	2	1	1		2	1		10	7	38	27
Satisfactory	2	1		1					1		3	2	12	8
Fair						1						1		4
Poor							1				1		4	
Not Rated	12	10	7	8	1	1	2	5	5	2	27	26		
4.26 Ability to Learn New Tasks (Employer Interview)														
Excellent	1	2	2	2	2			2	2		7	6	28	32
Good	3	4		3	2	3	2		1		8	10	32	53
Satisfactory	6	1	1	1				1	1		8	3	32	16
Fair	2										2		8	
Poor														
Not Rated	13	10	7	8	1	1	2	5	5	2	28	26		
4.27 Speed and Efficiency (Employee Interview)														
Excellent	2	1	2	2	3			1	1		8	4	32	22
Good	4	4		3	1	3	1		2		8	10	32	56
Satisfactory	3	2	1	1				1	1		5	4	20	22
Fair	3										3		12	
Poor	1										1		4	
Not Rated	12	10	7	8	1	1	3	6	5	2	28	27		

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% OF TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
4.28 Punctuality (Employer Interview)														
Excellent	5	3	2	2	3	2	1	3	3		14	10	54	53
Good	3	3		2	1	1	1				5	6	19	32
Satisfactory	2	1		1					1		3	2	12	11
Fair	1			1							1	1	4	5
Poor	2		1								3		12	
Not Rated	12	10	7	8	1	1	2	5	5	2	27	26		
4.29 Reliability (Employer Interview)														
Excellent	3	4	2	3	3	2	1	3	3		12	12	46	63
Good	5	3		3	1	1	1				7	7	27	37
Satisfactory	2								1		3		12	
Fair	1										1		4	
Poor	2		1								3		12	
Not Rated	12	10	7	8	1	1	2	5	5	2	27	26		

CHAPTER 6 FINDINGS: EXPERIENCES IN HIGH SCHOOL

Information regarding the graduates' experiences in high school was obtained from the graduates, their parents, and their former high school teachers and/or counselors. Table 5 presents the frequency of respondents to questionnaire items relating to those experiences for graduates with prior high school vocational training (T) and those with no vocational training (NT). It should be recalled that the determination of whether a particular graduate was classified T or NT was made on the basis of criteria presented in chapter 4. These determinations were made on the basis of school records and, as can be seen by the data in Table 5, the responses of the participants in the survey do not exactly agree with these classifications. For example, in Item 5.1, two NT graduates indicated that they had outside work experience, and in Item 5.4, parents of four NT graduates indicated their graduates as having had work experience in high school. These discrepancies resulted from these graduates and parents referring to experiences that were work related but did not qualify as "training" under the criteria used in this project.

In item 5.1, as could be expected, a majority (62%) of the NT group indicated that they had no type of vocational training in high school; the remainder of this group referred to various classes they were enrolled in, such as shop, clerical, art, and home economics. From the responses to this item, it is interesting to note that 12% of the T group stated that they had no vocational training in high school whereas their school records clearly indicate that they had such training.

Item 5.2 indicates that 52% of the T group rated their vocational classes or training as "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful" as contrasted to only 21% of the NT group, where 58% rated such experiences as "not helpful." When asked about the helpfulness of the work experience to the graduate (item 5.5) 75% of the parents of T graduates gave "very helpful" or "somewhat helpful" ratings.

When asked the general question regarding how effective high school was in the preparation of the graduate for work (Item 5.4) parents responded that for 57% of the T group and 42% of the NT group the experience was "very effective" or "somewhat effective."

School personnel, when asked the same question, (Item 5.8) indicated that 22% of the T group and 9% of the NT group were well prepared for work during high school.

School personnel indicated that the type of high school training students had in preparation for work (Item 5.6) was primarily academic classes in the 3-R's and office training for the NT group, whereas the T group had experiences across a wide spectrum of occupational areas. These findings are consistent with school personnel responses to item 5.7 indicating the specific skills students attained in high school.

The graduates in the T group were rated by school personnel as only slightly better adjusted to school (Item 5.9) with 63% of the T group being rated as "excellent" or "good" as compared to 58% of the NT group. The findings on this item may possibly indicate that there was little selectivity regarding which students were provided with vocational training, at least insofar as adjustment to school was concerned.

The extent to which school personnel assisted in the placement of

graduates on jobs after graduation (Item 5.10) was approximately one-third for the T group and 20% for the NT group.

There was no difference between the T and NT groups on the extent to which school personnel indicated that there had been a relationship between them and the graduates or parents since graduation, with approximately 30% responding "yes" to item 5.11 for both groups. An even smaller percentage (approximately 20% for the T and NT groups) of school personnel indicated they had been contacted by agencies regarding the graduate after high school graduation.

In general, the vocational training that the graduates received while in high school was viewed as helpful by the graduates and was even more positively rated by their parents. However, the school personnel did not feel that many of the graduates were well prepared for entry into the work world. According to both graduates and school personnel, the most prevalent type of vocational training received by the T group was clerical and office skills, although there were some of the other occupational areas represented.

Almost all of the graduates indicated that they needed some kind of help in getting a job after high school graduation, the kind of help ranging from self motivation to actual referrals by agencies and others.

Only one -third of the school personnel assisted in the placement of vocationally trained graduates in jobs after graduation. In addition, there appeared to be little relationship between graduates and their former teachers/counselors after graduation, nor was there much liaison between agencies and school personnel regarding the graduates.

Table 5

Frequency of Respondents to Questionnaire Items Relating to High School Experiences of Graduates with Prior High School Vocational Training (T) and with no Vocational Training (NT)

5.1 Type of Vocational Training in High School (Graduate Interview)

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% of TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
Foods, crafts, arts, P.E.	2			2							2	2	4	5
None	2	9	2	8		2		6	2		6	25	12	62
Shop classes	1	1	2	1	2	1					5	3	10	8
Clerical	6	3		2	2	1	1	1	4		13	7	26	18
Odd Jobs	1	1		1			1		1		3	2	6	5
Custodial	5		1								6		12	
Hospital Work	4				1				1		6		12	
Services; Supply/Food	3		2				1				6		12	
Child care/Teachers Aide	1		2					1			3	1	6	2
Not Rated		3	1		1		1		1	2	3	5		

5.2 How helpful were Vocational classes or training in preparation for work? (Graduate Interview)

Very Helpful	4		1	1	1			1	1		7	2	15	8
Somewhat Helpful	9	2	2		1		1	1	4		17	3	37	13
Slightly Helpful	7	3	2	2	2				1		12	5	26	21
Not Helpful	4	5	3	5	1	1	2	3			10	14	22	58
Not Rated	1	7	2	6		3	1	3	3	2	7	21		

5.3 After High School, what kind of help was needed to get and hold job? (Graduate Interview)

Dept of Rehab. or Workshop	4	3		2	2	2			1		7	7	15	19
Self Motivation	5	2	1	1				1	1		7	4	15	11
Schooling/Training	2	1	1	1	1			2	2	1	6	5	13	13
Family/Friend	1	2	1	5	1						3	7	7	19
Teachers/Counselor	4	1	1	2				1	1		6	4	13	11
Post High School follow-up	3	2	2	1			1		1		7	3	15	8
Other Agency	2	1	1	1	1			1	2		6	3	13	8
Better Health	1		1				1				3		7	
None	1	2	1				1	2			3	4	7	11
Not Rated	2	3	1	1		2	1	1	2	1	6	8		

5.4 Effectiveness of High School in preparation of graduate for work (Parent Interview)

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% of TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
Very Effective	1						1	2	2	1	4	3	9	8
Somewhat Effective	14	5	5	3		2	1	2	2		22	13	48	34
Somewhat Ineffective	4	4	3	6	3		1				11	10	24	26
Very Ineffective	6	6	2	3	1	1		2	1		9	12	20	32
Not Rated	1	2		2	1	1	1	2	4		7	7		

5.5 How helpful was Work Experience to Graduate? (Parent Interview)

Very Helpful	3	1					2	1	1			2	17	*
Somewhat Helpful	2		6	1			1		2		21	1	58	
Little Helpful	2	1	1	1							3	2	8	
Not Helpful	5		1								6		17	
Not Rated	3	15	2	12	5	4	1	7	6	2	17	40		

5.6 Courses student had in High School in preparation for work (School Personnel Interview)

Office Training	4	7	1	3	1		1	1	7		14	11	29	31
3R's	3	3		3	1	3		7	1	1	5	17	10	49
Shop classes	4	1	2		1						7	1	15	3
P.E		1		1								2		6
Janitorial/other	2	2	1	1	1		1				5	3	10	9
Services: Supply/Food	3	1	3								6	1	12	3
Hospital Aide	5				1						6		12	
Child Care	3		2								5		10	
Not Rated	1	2	1	6		1	2		1	1	5	10		

5.7 SpecificSkillsStudentAttained in High School (Teacher Interview)

Academic - 3R's	5	4	4	1	1	1		6	2	2	12	14	24	40
None	1	1	1	1				1			2	3	4	9
Promptness	2	2									2	2	4	6
Office Skills, Supply	5	1		1					2		7	2	14	6
Arts & Crafts	2	1		2	1		1				4	3	8	9
Typing	1	3	1	1	2		1		2		7	4	14	11
Few Skills	6	2	1	1		1			2		9	4	18	11
Social Skills	3			1				1			3	2	6	6
Mechanical Skills		1	2		1						3	1	6	3
Not Rated		2	1	6		2	2		1		4	10		

* N's too small for computation of percentages.

5.8 Degree to which school prepared student for work (Teacher Interview)

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% of TOTAL	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
Well Prepared	5		2		1			3	3		11	3	22	9
Somewhat Prepared	8	4	2	3		1	2	3	1		13	11	27	31
Little Prepared	10	9	5	4	3	1			4	1	22	15	45	43
Unprepared	2	1		1	1	1		2		1	3	6	6	17
Not Rated		3	1	6		1	2		1		4	10		

5.9 Student's Adjustment to school (Teacher Interview)

Excellent	4	3	1		1		2	6	4	1	12	10	24	29
Good	11	5	5	3	2			1	1	1	19	10	39	29
Fair	6	5	2	5		2			1		9	12	18	34
Poor	4	1	1		2	1		1	2		9	3	18	9
Not Rated		3	1	6		1	2		1		4	10		

5.10 Did you assist in placement of graduate on job after graduation? (Teacher Interview)

Yes	9	3	3		1	1		3	3		16	7	33	20
No	16	12	6	8	4	2	2	5	5	1	33	28	67	80
Not Rated		2	1	6		1	2		1	1	4	10		

5.11 Relationship with graduate or parents since graduation? (Teacher Interview)

Yes	7	3	2	1	1		1	5	4	1	15	10	31	29
No	18	12	7	7	4	2	1	3	4	1	34	25	69	71
Not Rated		2	1	6		2	2		1		4	10		

5.12 Agency contacts regarding graduate? (Teacher Interview)

Yes	3	2		1			1	2	5	2	9	7	19	22
No	22	11	8	7	5	2	1	5	2		38	25	81	78
Not Rated		4	2	6		2	2	1	2		6	13		

CHAPTER 7 FINDINGS: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Each graduate, parent and school personnel interviewed during this survey was asked to suggest ways in which the high school program could be improved in order to better meet the needs of handicapped students. The responses received from these three sources are presented in Table 6. The interviewers reported that conducting this portion of the interviews was the most difficult for graduates and parents due to a number of factors. Firstly, these questions required a shift in perspective from providing factual information or feelings about school and work to a conjectural frame of reference which tended to catch the respondents off guard. Thus, some respondents were unable to provide immediate suggestions for improvement of high school programs other than merely superficial ones such as "more vocational programs" or "more understanding teachers."

Secondly, the interviewers' impressions were that many respondents had not thought about how the high school program could have been improved: they had tended to put their school experiences behind them and had not given this much thought since graduation some years previously. Consequently, the interviewers were, in many cases, forced to make suggestions, such as, "Do you think there should be more counseling?" or "How about the amount of vocational training students receive?" Such leading suggestions tended to put responses in their minds which were not there before.

Thirdly, many of the respondents were feeling current life pressures which consumed the totality of their cognitive attention, leaving little left for concern with improving educational programs. For these reasons the responses were generally short, giving the im-

pression that they were somewhat superficial and off the top-of-the-head.

As shown in Item 6.1, 14% of the T graduates and 21% of the NT graduates had no suggestions on how programs could be improved. More of the T group (27%) indicated the need for more technical instruction as compared to 19% of the NT group. The interpersonal areas of "more counseling," "understanding teachers," and "tighter discipline" were suggested by 36% of the T group and 31% of the NT group.

Specific responses given by graduates, in order of prevalence, were: more vocational training; more understanding and better trained teachers and counselors; better reading, writing and math classes; better discipline and reinforcement in learning; programs in how to seek a job; more adaptive sports; avoid mixing "slow" students with "abnormal" ones; more work study programs; better school facilities; smoother transition from junior high to high school; better typewriters and more electronic gadgets; individual tutorial services; more field trips; smaller class sizes.

Parents' suggestions on how high school could be improved are presented in Item 6.2 and were similar to the graduates' responses in that 15% of the parents of T graduates and 12% of parents of NT graduates had no suggestions. Parents of both the T and NT groups stressed the need for more vocational and skills courses and the need for counseling for both students and parents. Of particular interest in the finding that 15% of the T group parents and 9% of the NT group parents mentioned "improving the self esteem of the students."

The parents rated the high school on how effective they felt the program was in preparing the graduates for work. Their ratings were

presented in Chapter 6, Item 5.4. Their comments to the follow-up probe question, "Why?" are presented here because some of them are reflective of ways in which they perceive the high school program as needing improvement. For those parents rating item 5.4 "very effective" or "somewhat effective," responses to the probe question included: work experience led to sellable skills; challenging and interesting school programs; concerned teachers; promoted understanding of life and developed character; feeling of achievement; provided for adequately paced learning.

For those parents giving "somewhat ineffective" or "very ineffective" ratings, responses to the probe question included: didn't acquire sellable skills; didn't obtain a basic education; little interaction between teachers and students; need to stay longer in special education; ineffective teachers; need more discipline.

Item 6.3 presents the responses provided by school personnel when asked to give ways the high school could have been improved in vocationally training the student. Twenty percent of the teachers of the T group indicated no improvement was needed as contrasted to only 12% of the NT group teachers. Both groups of teachers stressed the need for earlier and more vocational training, with approximately 38% of each group giving these suggestions. A follow-up program was suggested by 13% of the T group teachers and 3% of the NT group teachers. Of interest is the 12% of NT teachers indicating that the students in that group didn't choose helpful classes. This suggests that student selection of their high school programs may have influenced the extent and effectiveness of their vocational preparation.

TABLE 6

Frequency of Respondents to Questionnaire Items Relating to the Ways that High School Programs can be Improved for Graduates with Prior High School Vocational Training (T) and with No Vocational Training (NT)

6.1 WAYS HIGH SCHOOL COULD BE IMPROVED (GRADUATE INTERVIEW)

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% OF T	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
Technical Instruction	5	4	2	3	3		2	1	1		13	8	27	19
No Suggestions	4	4	1	2	1	3			1		7	9	14	21
More Counseling	4	2	1	3				3	1		6	8	12	19
Tighter Discipline	2	2	1	2			1		1		5	4	10	10
Understanding Teachers	3		3	1					1		7	1	14	2
Improve 3R's	1	1	1	1	1					1	3	3	6	7
Individual Attention	2	3		1							2	4	4	10
Higher Standards	2		1					1	1		4	1	8	2
Services for Special Handicaps	1					1		2	1		2	3	4	7
Mainstreaming								1				1		2
Not Rated	1	1		1			1		2	1	4	3		

6.2 WAYS HIGH SCHOOL COULD BE IMPROVED (PARENT INTERVIEW)

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% OF T	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
Vocational/Skills Courses	5	4			1	1	1				7	5	18	15
Pre-Post Counseling for Graduate & Parents	1	1	3	2	1			1	2		7	4	18	12
No Comment	3	2	1			1		1	2		6	4	15	12
Improve Self-Esteem	3	1	1	1	1			1			6	3	15	9
Better Teachers for Slow Learners	3		1	3				1			4	4	10	12
Have Variety of Voc. Ed. Experiences	4		1	1	1						6	1	15	3
Tighter Discipline		2	2	2		1					2	5	5	15
Stress Importance of High School	1	2		1							1	3	2	9
Improve 3R's				2				1				3		9
Mainstreaming			1					1			1	1	2	3
Not Rated	5	5		2	1	1	2	2	5	2	13	12		

6.3 WAYS HIGH SCHOOL COULD BE IMPROVED (TEACHER INTERVIEW)

	EMH		EH		HH		VH		PH		TOTAL		% OF T	
	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT
Earlier Voc. Training	5	4	4	2	1						10	6	22	18
More Voc. Training	2	3			2	1	1	2	2	1	7	7	15	21
Nothing Needed	5	2	1		1	1			2	1	9	4	20	12
Curriculum Changed	5	2	1					4			6	6	13	18
Communication Help	2	1	1	2	1			2			4	5	9	15
Follow-Up Program	4	1	1						1		6	1	13	3
Student Didn't Choose Helpful Classes	1	1	1	2		1					2	4	4	12
Diagnose Disabilities Earlier				1			1		1		2	1	4	3
Not Rated	1	3	1	7		1	2		3		7	11		

CHAPTER 8 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This survey of high school graduates of special education programs in the San Francisco Unified School District was concerned with assessing the adequacy of vocational training programs for Educable Mentally Handicapped, Educationally Handicapped, Hearing Handicapped, Visually Handicapped, and Physically Handicapped students. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 98 graduates who graduated from high school between 1972 and 1977, their parents, employers of working graduates, and school personnel who knew these graduates when in high school. For comparative purposes, data were collected on graduates who had high school vocational training (T) and on those who did not receive such training (NT).

The survey focussed on determining the current status of the graduates with regard to employment, how effective the high school training programs were in preparing them for the world of work and suggestions for strengthening the high school programs for future handicapped students.

The generalizability of the findings of this survey was limited due to extremely small samples in the Hearing Handicapped, Visually Handicapped, and Physically Handicapped groups, and the possibility of selection bias affecting the results.

This chapter is divided into two sections, the first summarizing the results of the survey and offering recommendations based upon the findings, and the second examining the survey model used for this study and recommending modifications to it based upon the experiences of the interviewers.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

In general, the study revealed a higher percentage of T graduates than NT graduates had held some type of job since graduation and that the jobs of the T graduates tended to be of a higher level, involving more cognitive and social skills as contrasted to the more physical jobs held by the NT group. More of the NT graduates were very dissatisfied with their jobs than were the T graduates. Parents of both groups were somewhat less satisfied with the graduates work positions than were the graduates themselves.

More of the T group indicated that the high school program had offered too little training for their current jobs than did the NT group. This is possibly reflective of the differing levels of jobs held by the two groups. On the other hand, employers of the T group reported that this group needed less supervision and on-the-job training than did employers of the NT group.

Very few of the T group and none of the NT group said they received help in getting their jobs from their high school counselors or teachers, their jobs being primarily obtained through agencies, rehabilitation counselors or friends. However, approximately one-third of the teachers of the T group and twenty percent of the teachers of the NT group stated that they did assist in the placement of graduates on jobs after graduation.

Employers rated the T group as being better able to relate to coworkers than were the NT group. However, the NT group was rated somewhat higher on their ability to learn new tasks, speed and efficiency, punctuality and reliability. Since these questions appeared toward

the end of the interview schedule, the interviewers had the impression that some employers of the NT graduates were possibly over-rating these employees to compensate for the low ratings they gave them on other variables such as on-the-job training and supervisorial needs.

Approximately half of the parents of both groups viewed the graduates' general high school experiences as effective in preparing them for work. The T graduates viewed their vocational classes or training as more helpful to them than did the NT group. Three-fourths of the parents of the T group viewed the work experience programs of their graduates as helpful.

Many graduates and parents had difficulty in answering questions that asked for suggestions on how high school programs could be improved in order to better meet the needs of handicapped students, with a number of them being unable to provide any suggestions. Both the T and NT groups asked for more technical instruction, counselling, tighter discipline, more individual attention and understanding teachers. Parents responded to these questions by suggesting that there be more and varied vocational and skills classes specifically designed for students with handicaps and more counseling during high school and after graduation for both graduates and parents. They also emphasized the need to attend to the improvement of students' self concepts and feelings of self worth.

Teachers stressed the need for early diagnosis of disabilities and the beginning of instruction in job-related skills earlier than in high school. They pointed to the need for more vocational training and outside work experience opportunities at the high school level, and a follow-up program of students after graduation.

Recommendations that flow directly from the survey results are as follows:

1. That there be provisions made for earlier detection of handicapping conditions in students at the elementary and junior high school levels.
2. That the development of job-related skills be begun prior to high school for students diagnosed as handicapped.
3. That there be articulation of training offerings among elementary, junior high and high school programs to provide for long range continuity of training for handicapped students.
4. That high school programs review their offerings in vocational training and provide more and varied classes designed for specific handicap groups.
5. That the outside work opportunities be expanded so that more handicapped students can obtain direct supervised on-the-job experience during high school.
6. That provisions be made for the development of positive self concepts and feelings of self worth for handicapped students while in high school.
7. That continual and intensive counseling be provided for handicapped students during high school.
8. That a follow-up program be established to offer guidance and assistance to graduates in the years immediately following graduation.
9. That a stronger liaison be established between the school system and other organizations offering assistance to handicapped individuals to insure continuity for graduates as they leave high school and enter adult life.

10. That counseling services be provided to parents of handicapped students during high school and immediately following graduation.

THE SURVEY PROCESS

Although the scope of this study was limited due to the small samples, the procedural aspects of the project did offer an adequate testing of the viability of the approach used in collecting the data. Since one of the goals of the project was to examine this approach as a model, the experiences of the interviewers offered many valuable insights into the process. Particular attention was given to documenting their experiences and subjective feelings as they employed this particular approach. This was accomplished in three ways: 1) During the period in which the interviews were taking place, weekly staff meetings of the interviewers were held in which experiences were shared and modifications to the process were made as needed. 2) At the conclusion of each interview, the interviewer wrote a summary impression of the interview, commenting on the setting, the ease or difficulty in interviewing, the attitude of the respondent, etc. 3) At the conclusion of the project a de-briefing meeting was held with the interviewers to obtain their over-all impressions of the data gathering process employed in this study. The following comments are derived from the above three sources, as well as the project staff's experiences in selecting and locating graduates and analyzing the data.

At the outset of the project difficulty was encountered in specifying the list of graduates between 1972 and 1977 in each of the handicap groups. Each high school was requested to supply such lists but were unable to develop complete rosters due to the method of record keeping, teacher personnel changes, etc. Most lists were eventually derived by

recovering original teacher registers. This process then involved obtaining transcripts of students and, from them, determining graduation dates, type of training in high school and other historical data. Because of the limited number of graduates identified in all but the educable mentally handicapped group, the decision was made to interview all of the graduates possible in the other handicap groups and to select a sample of the EMH graduates. Locating the graduates was a particularly perplexing task since many of them had moved from their last recorded address on school records and had left no forwarding address. Considerable staff time and energy was expended in trying to locate these individuals, with little success. This further reduced the effective sample sizes and introduced an element of selection bias. In the EMH group many names were pursued before an adequate sample size was obtained.

Interviewers were assigned to graduates based primarily on location. An attempt was made to have each interviewer interview graduates from all handicap groups rather than specialize in one handicap. Once assigned, the interviewer would conduct all four interviews (graduate, parent, employer, school personnel) for that individual. This procedure was found to be quite satisfactory in that it reduced interviewer bias across the handicap groups and provided an individual interviewer with four perspectives of the graduate. Interviewer halo effect of obtaining data from four sources on one individual was judged to be minimal.

Interviewers were provided with a semi-structured interview schedule in which the data requested were listed as topical headings

rather than in narrative question form. This was judged by the interviewers to be the most effective form since they needed flexibility to conduct the interviews and ask questions in forms suitable to particular circumstances which varied considerably from individual to individual.

The interviewers selected for this project had the particular personal qualities that resulted in very few refusals, once they had made the initial contact. Also, there were very few denials of permission to interview parents or employers. This positive response is attributed mainly to the skill of the interviewers to establish rapport and trust with the graduates.

Most interviews with graduates were conducted in their homes. This was found to be the most satisfactory arrangement, since making appointments to meet at another location such as the research office, tended to be forgotten or overlooked by the graduates. Interviewers reported that, for the most part, graduates were quite willing to answer the interviewers' questions and were generally pleased that someone was taking an interest in them and respecting their opinions. In this connection, the ten dollar stipend offered to each graduate interviewed seemed to make little difference in the cooperation received. Interviewers generally felt that the interviews could have been just as successfully conducted without this monetary inducement. However, the interviewers did feel that it was nice gesture to pay graduates for their time, since many of them could use the money.

Interviewers reported that parents were present in the homes during approximately one-half of the graduate interviews but did not interfere with the interview process. In some cases, the parent in-

terviews were conducted immediately following the graduate interviews, but a few parents requested the interviewer to return another day for their interviews.

In many interviews with graduates and parents, interviewers were asked if they could supply any leads on jobs or agencies that could be of assistance to the graduate. This had not been anticipated, since the survey was designed to collect data only--not to provide service. Interviewers did begin developing their own informal lists and did supply referals where possible. Future surveys of this nature would do well to provide interviewers with complete lists of resources to share with graduates. The interviewers in this study discovered that there was a great need for this service.

Interviewers formed the impression that many of the graduates and parents had intense personal and family problems which made it hard to focus on their impressions of high school experiences and even more difficult to make suggestions for program improvement.

Employer interviews were held during working hours at the job site. Most employers were quite cooperative with the interviewers but some were pressed for time. Particularly helpful were supervisors in vocational rehabilitation agencies and other sheltered environments where the major thrust was to develop skills of handicapped individuals.

School personnel interviews were the most difficult to obtain due to several reasons: 1) For the most part, it was necessary to conduct these interviews during school days in which free teacher time was at a premium; 2) Due to the large turn-over of staff in some schools it was difficult to locate former teachers who had personal knowledge of the graduate while in high school; 3) Some teachers had difficulty in

remembering the former students; and 4) School personnel interviews were mostly scheduled last in the sequence of four interviews concerning each graduate. Consequently, many of these interviews were being conducted during June--a most difficult month to contact teachers.

Based on the experience of this survey process it is recommended to others attempting such surveys that all school records, transcripts, work evaluations, and teacher interviews be assembled prior to conducting interviews with graduates, parents, and employers. This would give interviewers a solid informational base to aid them in probing for further information.

Analysis of the data obtained through the interview process was performed by reducing the verbal responses to each question to an array of categories derived from a content analysis of the responses themselves. Had a broader sampling base been possible, various cross-break analyses involving two or more variables would have been performed. Hopefully, this would have revealed some interesting relationships between variables as well as differential findings for the various handicap groups. As it was, the quantity of data in this study only permitted descriptive statistics in the form of frequency distributions for each item for each handicap group.

The over-riding impression of the interviewers and staff at the conclusion of the project was that, although they encountered a number of graduates who were living in depressing situations, including having difficulty with parents, coming from broken homes, having over-protective parents, etc., there was a general pervasive optimism and determination on the part of the graduates to succeed in whatever they were doing, to advance in life and to make the most of the situations in which they

find themselves. All interviewers expressed the feeling that the mere process of following up on the graduates and thereby indicating to them that someone is really concerned about their welfare had a totally beneficial effect on many of their lives.

APPENDIX A

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
625 HOLLOWAY AVENUE, Room 14
San Francisco, California 94112

Dear

This letter may earn you $10.00 for about thirty minutes of your time so take the time to read all of it.

The San Francisco School District is trying to contact some of its recent graduates in order to find out what has happened to them following graduation. We are interested in learning what you have been doing in the areas of education and employment. We hope that what we learn from people like you will help our high schools better prepare their students for entrance into the adult world.

The cooperation of each graduate who receives this letter is important to the success of this survey. We will pay you $10.00 (State Research fund) for allowing us to interview you and find out what you have been doing about working or looking for a job, and ways the schools could have assisted you more in your entrance into the work world.

If you are willing to take part in this short interview please return the tear-off sheet below. Fill out the section indicating your current address and phone. Please tell us whether a morning, afternoon, or evening interview is best for you. Shortly after we receive this completed form from you someone will contact you to set up the time, date, and place for the interview.

I hope you will be able to take part and assist us in this study as we try to improve our school programs for future graduates.

Sincerely,

Douglas A. Boyce
Supervisor

Tear off and return this part

SFUSD SURVEY PARTICIPANT

☐ Yes, I'd like to be part of your survey.

I graduated from _____ High School, YEAR _____

NAME _____
Please Print

ADDRESS _____
Street City State Zip

PHONE (Home) _____ (Work) _____

The best interview time for me is: ☐ MORNINGS ☐ AFTERNOONS ☐ EVENINGS

APPENDIX B

SFUSD

San Francisco Unified School District 135 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco California 94102

March 28, 1978

This letter serves as an introduction for _____ whose position is to interview former graduates of the San Francisco Unified School District.

The purpose of the interviews is to learn about graduates' activities since graduation with respect to vocational placement. We are anxious to know what success and/or problems graduates have encountered job wise in adjusting to the work world.

The San Francisco Unified School District wishes to thank you for your cooperation in these interviews and for your assistance in helping us improve our educational programs.

Sincerely,

Douglas A. Boyce

Douglas A. Boyce, Supervisor

DAB:md

an equal opportunity employer

APPENDIX C

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
135 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102

Follow-up Study of Former High School Graduates

Date_____

I give permission for a San Francisco Unified School District interviewer to speak with my parents/guardian and employers. This information is being obtained on former high school graduates to determine how the schools may better serve students prior to entering the work world.

It is may understanding that this information will be confidential and my name will not be used.

_____
Graduate's Signature

_____
Interviewer's Signature

APPENDIX D

INITIAL FORM
GRADUATE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Name_____Project Code___Date___Interviewer_____

High School_____Year Graduated_____

I. HISTORY SINCE HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

What have you been doing since high school graduation?
Additional schooling When, where, how long, for what purpose?
Living arrangements At home? Apartment? With others?

II WORK EXPERIENCE

Current job_____Phone number_____
Company_____Immediate supervisor_____
Address_____Time period on job_____
_____hrs. per day;___days per week
What is your specific job? Task?
What specific skills do you need for the job?
How much on-the-job training do you need for your task? None Some A lot
How much supervision do you need? None Some A lot

Previous jobs, if any. (same information as above)
Reason(s) for leaving job?

III JOB SATISFACTION

How satisfied are you with your present job?
Very Satis. Somewhat Satis. Somewhat Dissatis. Not Satis.

Why are you satisfied (or dissatisfied)?
What do you like about your job?
What do you dislike about your job?

(If appropriate) Why have you changed jobs?
Who helped you get your first job? Parent__Relative__Friend__
Employment Office _____Private employment agency___Teacher_____
Rehab counselor___No one__Other_____

What problems did you have in finding a job? No work__Pay too low_____
Didn't have skills__Transportation__Hours__Other_____

If you found your own job, how did you do it?

What skills do you use on the job that were learned in school? Typing, filing, telephone answering, clerical, making change, sorting, assembly, repair work, keeping records, talking, writing, use of tools, etc.

Do you feel you are qualified to get a better job than you now have?
Why?
What kind of job?

What skills do you use on the job that were learned in school? Typing, filing, telephone answering, clerical, making change, sorting, assembly, repair work, keeping records, talking, writing, use of tools, etc.

Do you feel you are qualified to get a better job than you now have?
Why?
What kind of job?

Is there opportunity for you to get a better job where you are now working?
Why?

How much physical effort is needed to perform your present job?
Physically exhausting Average Activity Little energy required

Is your job mentally and/or emotionally tiring?
Extremely Somewhat None

If personal problems occur on the job, is there someone you can go to for help other than the boss or fellow worker?
Parent___Friend___Teacher___Rehab Counselor___Agency___Other___

When you have personal problems not connected with work, do you get help in solving them by someone?
Friend___Parent___Teacher___Minister___Other_____

IV. HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION

What in your high school experience helped prepare you for your job?
Vocational classes? What type? What skills?
Other classes?
Outside work experience?
Inside work experiences?

How helpful was your high school education in training you for your work?
Very Helpful Somewhat Helpful Not Helpful

Why?

V. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING TRAINING

How could the high school program be improved in training students for the world of work?
Outside work experience
Inside work experience
Specific job skills training
Interpersonal relationships
Etc.

What would you have liked to learn in high school that would have helped you on your job?

What kind of help did you need in getting and holding a job after high school that you didn't get in high school.

INITIAL FORM
PARENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Name of Graduate_____Date_____ Code No. _____

Parent/Guardian_____Interviewer_____

I. STATUS OF GRADUATE

What has graduate been doing since graduation from high school? Where living? Working? etc.

II. WORK EXPERIENCE

What kind(s) of job is he/she doing?
How satisfied are you with son's/daughter's work position?
Very Satis. Somewhat Satis. Somewhat Dissatis. Very Dissatis.

How satisfied do you feel your son/daughter is with his/her job?
Very Satis. Somewhat Satis. Somewhat Dissatis. Very Dissatis.

Why?

III HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE OF GRADUATE

How effective do you feel the high school program was for your son/daughter in preparing him/her for the world of work?
Very Satis. Somewhat Satis. Somewhat Dissatis. Very Dissatis.

Why?

Did your son/daughter take part in a supervised work assignment on or off campus during high school?

Yes No Don't Know

If yes, was this helpful in preparing him/her for work?

Yes Somewhat No

How?

If no, do you think this could have been helpful in preparing him/her for work?

How?

IV SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING TRAINING

How could the high school education program be improved in order to better prepare graduates for the adult world?

What kind of training programs are needed to prepare student for work?

INITIAL FORM
EMPLOYER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Name of Graduate_____ Date_____ Interviewer_____

Employer_____ Company_____

Address_____ Phone_____

Date of Employment_____

Position_____

What specific tasks or functions does the employee perform in his/her job?

What skills are required of the employee?

How was the employee hired? Advertisement, agency referral(private), public agency, friend, walk-in etc.

How much on the job training was needed to perform the job?

How well prepared was the person for your job when you hired him/her?

How much supervision is needed on the job?

How would you rate this employee on:	High				Low
ability to perform job	5	4	3	2	1
relating with coworkers	5	4	3	2	1
ability to learn new tasks	5	4	3	2	1
speed and efficiency	5	4	3	2	1
punctuality	5	4	3	2	1
reliability	5	4	3	2	1

Did you discover any apparent deficiencies where the schools have better prepared the employee? Academic, Skill training, Social relations, Emotional development, etc.

How effective was the high school training and education of this employee in preparing him/her for employability?

INITIAL FORM
SCHOOL PERSONNEL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Name of Graduate_____ School_____

Year Graduated_____ Interviewer_____ Date_____

Person Interviewed_____ Position_____

Relationship to graduate as a high school student_____

How well did you know this student when in school?

What specific courses or experiences did this student have while in high school to prepare him/her for the world of work?

What salable skills did the student attain while in high school?

When the student graduated, how well was he/she prepared to enter the work world?
Well prepared Somewhat prepared Not prepared

Why?

Excell. Good Fair Poor
What was the student's general adjustment to school?
How well did he/she do in school?

How could the vocational training of this student have been improved while in high school?

Did you assist in the placement of the graduate on a job after graduation?
If yes, explain.

Have you seen or heard from the graduate or parents since graduation?
If yes, explain.

Has any agency contacted you about the graduate since graduation?
If yes, explain.

APPENDIX E

GRADUATE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE Code_____

Name_____ Date_____

High School_____Year_____ Interviewer_____

I. HISTORY SINCE HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Living Arrangements:

Work History:

II. CURRENT WORKING ARRANGEMENT (if any)

Current job: Immed. Supervisor:

Company: Phone:

Address: Time on job:

Distance from home: ____hrs/day ____days/week

Transportation:

Specific Task:

Skills needed:

Amount of on-the-job training needed;.....__A lot
Type of on-the job training needed: __Some
__Little
__None

Amount of supervision needed:.....__A lot
Type of supervision needed: __Some
__Little
__None

Previous jobs, if any, and reasons for leaving:

III JOB SATISFACTION

How satisfied with job..... ___Very satisfied
Why? ___Somewhat satisfied
___Somewhat dissatisfied
___Not satisfied

Likes about job:

Problems in finding the job:

How did you get the job?

Job skills that were learned in High School:

Job skills that were learned on the job:

Are you qualified for a better job?.....___Yes ___No
Why:

Opportunity for advancement?.....___Yes ___No
Why?

Would you like to change jobs?.....___Yes ___No
Why:

Physical effort needed on job.....___Excessive
___Average
___Little

Mental/emotional demands of job.....___Excessive
___Average
___Little

On-the-job, who helps with personal problems?

Off-the-job, who helps with personal problems?

IV. HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION

Type of voc. training or classes in preparation for job (Outside or Inside Work Exp.)

How helpful in preparation for work?..... .....
Why?

___Very helpful
___Somewhat helpful
___Slightly helpful
___Not helpful

V. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING TRAINING IN H S.

How could high school program have been improved?

What would you have liked to learn in high school?

After high school, what kind of help did you need to get and hold a job?

VI. INTERVIEWER S COMMENTS AND IMPRESSIONS

APPENDIX E

PARENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE Code No._____

Graduate's Name_____Date_____

Parent/Guardian_____Interviewer_____

I. STATUS OF GRADUATE (Where living; what doing; etc.)

II. WORK EXPERIENCE

Type of Job:

Parent's satisfaction with graduate's work position.... ___Very satisfied
Why? ___Somewhat satis
___Somewhat dissatis.
___Very dissatis.

Parent's perception of graduate's satisfaction..... ___Very satisfied
___Somewhat satis.
___Somewhat dissatis.
___Very dissatis.

III. HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE OF GRADUATE

Effectiveness in preparing graduate for work.... ..... ___Very effective
Why? In what way? ___Somewhat effective
___Somewhat ineffective
___Very ineffective

Did graduate have work experience in high school?..... ___Yes
What type? ___No
___Don't know

If yes, how helpful to graduate?..... ___Very helpful
In what way? ___Somewhat helpful
___Little helpful
___Not helpful

IV. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

Ways it could have been improved:

Kinds of training needed:

V. INTERVIEWER'S COMMENTS AND IMPRESSIONS

APPENDIX E

EMPLOYER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Graduate's Name_____Date____Interviewer_____

Employer_____Company_____

Address_____Phone_____

Dates of Employment_____Position_____

I. JOB DESCRIPTION

Specific tasks or functions of graduate:

Skills required:

Amount of supervision needed:

Amount and type of on-the-job training needed:

How was employee hired?

How well prepared was graduate for the job when hired?

How could the high school have better prepared the employee?

Ratings:	Excellent				Poor
Ability to perform job	5	4	3	2	1
Relating to coworkers	5	4	3	2	1
Ability to learn new tasks	5	4	3	2	1
Speed and efficiency	5	4	3	2	1
Punctuality	5	4	3	2	1
Reliability	5	4	3	2	1

II INTERVIEWER'S COMMENTS AND IMPRESSIONS

APPENDIX E

SCHOOL PERSONNEL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Graduate's Name_____School_____

Year Graduated_____Interviewer_____Date_____

Person Interviewed_____Position_____

Relationship to graduate as high school student_____

How well did you know student in school?

Specific courses/experiences student had in school in preparation for work?

Specific skills student attained in high school:

Degree to which school prepared student for work.....___well prepared
Why? In what way? ___somewhat prepared
___little prepared
___Unprepared

Student's general adjustment to school.....___Excellent
Describe: ___Good
___Fair
___Poor

Ways high school program could have been improved in vocationally training student:

Did you assist in placement of graduate on job after graduation.....____Yes
Explain: ____No

Any relationship with graduate or parents since graduation?.... ....____Yes
Explain: ____No

Agency contacts regarding graduate?.....____Yes
____No

APPENDIX F

COMPUTER CARD CODING SCHEDULE

1. HANDICAP

1. EMH
2. EH
3. HH
4. VH
5. PH

2. TYPE OF HIGH SCHOOL VOCATIONAL TRAINING

1. Outside Work Experience
2. No Outside Work Experience

3.4. INDIVIDUAL NUMBER

01-49 Males
51-99 Females

5. 2. 1972
3. 1973
4. 1974
5. 1975
6. 1976
7. 1977

6. LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

1. At home - with parents/siblings/or grandparents
2. With spouse or with spouse and child
3. With child only
4. Alone
5. With roommate or friend

7. FURTHER SCHOOL/TRAINING

1. College (now or past)
2. Trade school training
3. None
4. Still going to college
5. Military
6. Both college and trade school

continued

8. WORK STATUS

1. Has never worked
2. Working full-time (Independent job)
3. Working part time " "
4. Working full-time Rehab (Sheltered Agency)
5. Working part time " "
6. Odd jobs
7. Insufficient Information (On previous job)

9. Job Type

1. Physical Skills-small or large muscles and/or manual dexterity
2. Social Skills
3. Mental Skills
4. Combination of 1,2,& 3 (above)
5. Combination of 1 & 3 (Physical and Mental)
6. Combination of 1 & 2 (Physical and Social)

10. Transportation (to Job)

1. Walk
2. Bus
3. Car
4. Works at home
5. Boat

11. Primary Job Skills needed

0. None
1. Small muscle (i.e. factory assembly work)
2. Large muscle (i.e. gardening, janitorial, maid, cook)
3. Clerical
4. Common sense and responsibility-Able to self supervise (i.e. pizza delivery)
5. Relating to People (teacher's aid, recreation leader), semi-professional
6. Mechanical knowledge (i.e. auto repair, carpentry)
7. Decision making-specific skill (i e. photo lab developer, plumber, criminologist, courtesy clerk-variety of tasks)

12. Amount of On The Job Training Needed

1. A Lot
2. Some
3. Little
4. None

continued

13. Amount of Supervision Needed

1. A Lot
2. Some
3. Little
4. None

14. Job Satisfaction

1. Very Satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Not satisified

15. Problems in Finding Job

1. Difficulty in Interviews
2. Too little experience-needs more training or basic skills
3. No problems (or few)
4. Filling our resume or application
5. No problem-because Rehabilition agency sponsored placement
6. Passing tests

16. How did graduate get the job

1. Rehabilitation counselor
2. Friend
3. Agency (i.e. CETA, NYC unemployment, Unions, etc.)
4. Self
5. High school counselor or teacher recommendation
6. Parent

17. Job Skills learned in High School

1. Electronics-soldering (metal shop)
2. Office Training (typing, copymachine, filing, business machines)
3. None or few
4. Other (i.e. Arts & Crafts, foods, drama)
5. Services (i.e. Gardening, Cafeteria, Janitorial, Hospital)
6. Mechanics (i.e. machine and tool work, cars, repair)
7. Academic Skills-reading (i.e. college prep and remedial classes)
8. Combination-Rehab agency and office training

continued

18. Job Skills Learned on the job

0. None
1. Reading and math.
2. Working with hands (assembly, janitorial, gardening)
3. Beginning Clerical Skills (mail room, supply clerk, filing)
4. Construction (i.e. carpentry, bricklaying, pipe fitter)
5. Child care
6. Office machines (i.e. typing, computer processing)
7. Serving people (receptionist, food service, clerks)
8. Mechanics (car repair, welder)
9. Dealing with people (social skills teaching, rec. leader)

19. Are you qualified for a better job?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N.A.

20. Opportunity for Advancement?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N.A.

21. Would you like to change jobs?

1. Yes
2. No
3. N.A.

22. Physical effort needed on the job

1. Excessive
2. Average
3. Little

23. Mental/emotional demands of job

1. Excessive
2. Average
3. Little

24. On the job, who helps with personal problems?

1. Friend
2. No one
3. Supervisor
4. Co-workers
5. Self
6. Family

continued

25. Off-the-job, who helps with personal problems?

1. Parents or Family
2. No one
3. Friends
4. Spouse
5. School counselor

26. Type of Vocational Training in High School

0-4 On campus
0. Foods, Arts, and Crafts, P.E.
1. None
2. Shop classes (auto, wood, metal)
3. Clerical
4. Odd jobs on campus

5-9 Work experience (O.W.E.)
5. Custodial services
6. Hospital work
7. Supply clerk/on the job clerical related
8. Cafeteria food services
9. Child care-teachers aide

27. How helpful was vocational class or training in preparation for work?

1. Very helpful
2. Somewhat helpful
3. Slightly helpful
4. Not helpful

28. How could high school program have been improved?

0. More concentration on 3R's
1. More technical instruction, more classes or improvement of existing program (trade school, work experience, summer programs)
2. No suggestions (students thought program good as is, or indifferent to school, or had no ideas)
3. More understanding teachers (caring)
4. More individualized attention (during classtime)
5. Mainstreaming
6. Teachers need to demand and expect a high academic standard for Special Educational Student.
7. More discipline-tighter control
8. More pre and post counseling and guidance for work (i.e. deal with stress, job exploration field trips, follow-up counseling)
9. Services for specific handicap (i.e. learning braille, teachers with knowledge of sign language, adaptive P.E.)

continued

29. After high school, what kind of help did you need to get and hold a job?

1. Dept. of Rehabilitation or Comm. Rehab. Workshop
2. Other Agencies (i.e. YMCA, NYC, CETA, etc)
3. None
4. Family and friends
5. Teachers and counselors
6. Self motivation
7. Need Post follow-up would be helpful (does not exist now)
8. Good health
9. Need more schooling or additional training.

PARENT INTERVIEW

30. Parent's satisfaction with graduate's work position

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very satisfied
5. Graduate Refused Permission
6. No Interview possible

31. Parent's perception of graduate's satisfaction

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

32. Effectiveness of high school in preparing graduate for work

1. Very effective
2. Somewhat effective
3. Somewhat ineffective
4. Very ineffective

33. Did graduate have work experience in high school

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

34. If yes, how helpful to graduate?

1. Very helpful
2. Somewhat helpful
3. Little helpful
4. Not helpful

35. Suggestions for improving high school experience

0. Improve academic foundation 3R's
1. Mainstreaming
2. Provide more vocational training-trade skills and practical skills
3. No comment
4. Improve quality and quantity of teachers to work with slow learners
5. Help handicapped students to realize the importance of a high school education in obtaining a job
6. Have school personnel and students in developing self esteem (provide encouragements and less "labeling" of special educ. handicaps)
7. More discipline and moral training needed
8. Increase variety of experiences in voc. training. Have teachers be sensitive to students personal interests and job preferences.
9. Follow-up programs, pre and post counseling for graduate and parent.

EMPLOYER INTERVIEW

36. Specific tasks or functions of graduate

1. Manual dexterity-small muscle
2. Physical education
3. Public service (i.e. teaching, security guard, recreation leader, radio dispatcher)
4. Laborer (i.e. construction, landscape maintenance, janitorial, bed-making)
5. Deliveries, Food Service and Salesmen (i e. messenger, pizza delivery, cook, shoe salesman)
6. Office work (i.e. mail clerk, typing, business machines, keypunch operator, receptionist)
7. Other

37. Amount of Supervision needed.

1. None or little
2. Some
3. A lot
4. Excessive
5. No interview-not employed
6. No Interview-graudate refused permission
7. No interview possible

38. Amount of on-the job training needed

1. Needed skills before hiring
2. Not much (minimal)
3. Information on following directions on a specific skill
4. Lots of on-the-job training
5. Orientation and training by agency or school previous to hiring (i.e. Comm. Rehab. Workshop)

39. How was employee hired?

1. Dept. of Rehabilitation
2. Friend
3. Self motivated
4. Misc. agency (i.e. unemployment, CETA or church)
5. Teacher or School Counselor
6. Family
7. College Placement

40. How well prepared was the graduate for the job when hired?

1. Well prepared
2. Prepared
3. Somewhat prepared
4. Not prepared
5. Don't know

RATINGS OF GRADUATE PERFORMANCE ON THE JOB

41. Ability to perform job

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Satisfactory
4. Fair
5. Poor

42. Relating to co-workers

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Satisfactory
4. Fair
5. Poor

43. Ability to learn new tasks

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Satisfactory
4. Fair
5. Poor

44. Speed and efficiency

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Satisfactory
4. Fair
5. Poor

45. Punctuality

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Satisfactory
4. Fair
5. Poor

46. Reliability

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Satisfactory
4. Fair
5. Poor

SCHOOL PERSONNEL INTERVIEW

47. Specific courses student had in high school in preparation for work
1-4 Courses on campus - #5-9 Off campus work experience

1. Shop classes (i.e. metal shop, wood shop, mechanics welding etc.)
2. Physical Education (i.e. football boxing)
3. Basics - Remedial, 3R's or College Prep. classes
4. Office training
5. Janitorial or other (i.e. Child Development, Art, Theater)
6. Supply Room and Business
7. Hospital, including Nurses's Aide
8. Child Care, (OWE) i.e. Teacher's Aide
9. Food Services

48. Specific Skills student attained in high school

0. None
1. Promptness
2. Academic-3R's
3. Office Skills
4. Arts and Crafts
5. Typing
6. Supplies
7. Few Skills
8. Social Skills, Living Skills
9. Mechanics, skill using tools

49. Degree to which school prepared student for work

1. Well prepared
2. Somewhat prepared
3. Little prepared
4. Unprepared
5. No interview possible

50. Student's general adjustment to school

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

51. Ways High School Program could have been improved in Vocationally Training Student

1. Increase fundamentals 3R's
2. Curriculum changes - to get Educational Handicapped into Special Education Vocational Program.
3. Communication help (i.e. Social Skills, Survival Skills, Self Awareness, Individual Attention)
4. Nothing needed.
5. More Vocational Training
6. Vocational Training at an earlier age.
7. Students didn't choose to take those Vocational classes that might have assisted them.
8. Follow-up program
9. Catch disability at an earlier age.

52. Did you assist in placement of graduate on job after graduation?

1. Yes
2. No

53. Any relationship with graduate or parents since graduation?

1. Yes
2. No

54. Agency contacts regarding graduate?

1. Yes
2. No